

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on December 2, 2003 is acknowledged. Reconsideration of the above-mentioned application is hereby requested in view of the remarks which follow.

Claim 1

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent 5,836,782 (hereinafter referred to as "Odley et al."). With respect to claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Figures 1 and 2 depict admitted prior art comprising a "connector (1) for RF coaxial lines (3) comprising two connector halves for establishing contact with an outer conductor of the RF coaxial line (3) by means of an insulation displacement connection with at least one cutting edge (2) arranged on each connector half, the cutting edges (2) being arranged opposite each other in the longitudinal axial direction of the outer conductor (8), wherein two connector halves are arranged on the RF line (3)."

The Examiner does affirm that the admitted prior art does not show the cutting edges being arranged opposite each other in a staggered and parallel offset manner. In addition, the admitted prior art does not establish a cold welding type connection with the outer conductor after penetration of the outer insulation of the RF coaxial line. Furthermore, the prior art does not disclose cutting edges that slide on the outer conductor without a gap being formed between the cutting edges and the outer conductors if the distance separating the end faces changes and are arranged symmetrically with respect to a plane extending along the longitudinal axial direction of the outer conductor and the cutting edge pairs overlapping each other.

The Examiner asserts that Odley et al. depicts, in Figures 1 and 2, a connector (10) showing cutting edges (2, 4) arranged opposite each other in staggered and parallel offset manner with two cutting edges (2, 4) overlapping each other. Thus, the Examiner believes that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the connector of the Applicant's admitted prior art by having cutting

edges arranged opposite each other in staggered manner and at least one adjacent side face thereof." The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

A "determination of obviousness cannot be based on hindsight combination of components selectively culled from the prior art to fit the parameters of the patented invention." *ADT Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.*, 159 F.3d 534, 546, 48 U.S.P.Q.2d 1321, 1329 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Prior art references are properly combined only when there is a suggestion, teaching or motivation comes from the prior art references themselves. *C.R. Bard, Inv. v. M3 Systems, Inc.*, 157 F.3d 1340, 1352, 48 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1225, 1232 (Fed. Cir. 1998). In determining the issue of obviousness, one must look to the collective teachings of the references and to whether the hypothetical person of ordinary skill in the art, familiar with such teachings, would have found it obvious to make a structure corresponding to that which is claimed. *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 425, 208 U.S.P.Q. 871, 881 (CCPA 1981); *In re Sernaker*, 702 F.2d 989, 994, 217 U.S.P.Q. 1, 5 (Fed. Cir. 1983). With this understanding, it is apparent that the combination of Odley and the admitted prior art do not render the invention recited in claim 1 obvious.

Claim 1 claims a connector for RF coaxial lines comprising, in part, connector halves each with at least one cutting edge arranged in a staggered and parallel offset manner in the longitudinal axial direction. The Examiner combines Odley and the admitted prior art to teach this limitation and in doing so, ignores the collective teachings of Odley. In the abstract, Odley states that the angle between the wire and the first or second portions is in the range between 5° and 85° and is typically 45°. When combining Odley and the admitted prior art, the Examiner mistakenly ignores this teaching.

Odley explains that the electrical connector taught therein comprises a first element 2 disposed in a first plane 3 and a second element 4 disposed in a second plane 5. (See column 3, lines 12-16). "In the preferred embodiment, planes 3 and 5 are perpendicular to each other." (See column 3, lines 21-22). This entire configuration allows the sharp corners of the elements to contact the wire and increases the pressure of the contact points on the wire as the wire forms an "S" shape when positioned in the slot. (See column 3, lines 34-42). This entire

teaching must be considered as a whole when combining Odley with the admitted prior art. Accordingly, in order to properly utilize the staggered elements in the positions taught by Odley, one must also orientate the elements at an angle with respect to the wire. Thus, the elements are not orientated parallel with respect to each other.

When the teaching of Odley, in its entirety, is considered and combined with the admitted prior art, the claimed invention is not obvious. Incorporating the angled contact elements taught by Odley into the admitted prior art would result in contact elements with cutting edges arranged opposite each other in a non-parallel manner, but rather at a preferred angle of 45°. As claim 1 requires that the cutting edges be arranged parallel, the combination would not render claim 1 obvious when the teachings of Odley and the admitted prior art are considered in their entirety.

Claim 7

In rejecting claim 7, the Examiner asserts that the admitted prior art teaches an electrical contact (1) for making a connection with a coaxial cable (3) outer conductor, wherein the coaxial cable is comprised of an inner signal conductor, an inner core surrounding the signal conductor and conductive shielding. In addition, the Examiner asserts that the admitted prior art teaches that the contact (1) further includes at least one upstanding side edge portion (5) formed by first and second portions (2) having side faces (side of 2) generally aligned along a vertical axis, as is depicted in Figures 1 and 2.

The Examiner admits that the admitted prior art does not teach, in part, end faces axially staggered in an axial direction of the cable profiled for cutting through the outer insulation with the end faces trapping the conductive shielding therebetween.

The Examiner believes that Odley discloses an electrical contact (10) having end faces (2a) axially staggered in an axial direction of a cable (32), side faces (2, 4) profiled for cutting through the outer insulation (8) while the end faces (2a) trap the conductive shielding (6) therebetween. Thus, the Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the contact of the admitted prior art by including end faces which are axially staggered in an axial direction of the cable with the side faces being profiled

Appl. No. 09/701,349
Amdt. Dated April 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2003

for cutting through the outer insulation so that the end faces may trap the conductive shielding therebetween, as taught by Odley to enable the contact to accept wider cables without risking damages to the insulation displacement connection. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As described above with respect to claim 1, the invention of Odley requires that the first and second elements be arranged preferably perpendicular to one another and at a preferred 45° angle to the wire. (See column 3, lines 47-49). This configuration is demonstrated in Figures 1 and 1A of Odley, which depicts contact points 2a, 4a displacing insulation on the wire rather than side faces that cut through the outer insulation of the cable.

As explained above, the collective teachings of Odley requires that the side faces be arranged perpendicular to each other. This is inopposite to that recited in claim 7 which requires that the side faces be generally aligned along a vertical axis parallel to one another. When considering the axial staggering of the end faces, the Examiner must also consider the perpendicular orientations thereof in order to properly combine the teachings of Odley and the admitted prior art. Accordingly, the combination of Odley and the admitted prior art does not does not render claim 7, including the requirement that the side faces be generally aligned along a vertical axis, obvious.

Conclusion

For all of the remarks mentioned herein, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above application. Applicants believe claims 1 and 7 are allowable over the combination set forth by the Examiner, for the reasons stated above. Furthermore, as all remaining claims depend from claims 1 and 7, applicants believe all claims are currently in condition for allowance and request passage thereof.

If necessary to effect a timely response, please consider this paper a request for an extension of time, and charge any shortages in fees, or apply any overpayment credits, to Baker & Daniels' Deposit Account No. 02-0387 (72262.00007). However, please do not include the payment of issue fees.

Appl. No. 09/701,349
Amdt. Dated April 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2003

Respectfully submitted,




Eric J. Groen, Reg. No. 32,230
BAKER & DANIELS
205 West Jefferson Boulevard, Suite 250
South Bend, IN 46601
Telephone: (574) 234-4149
Fax: (574) 239-1900

I hereby certify that this correspondence is
being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First
Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

April 30, 2004

Date



Eric J. Groen, Reg. No. 32,230